

November 17, 2004

MEMORANDUM TO: Catherine Haney, Program Director
Policy and Rulemaking Programs
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs, NRR

FROM: Timothy A. Reed, Senior Reactor Systems Engineer \RA\
Policy and Rulemaking Program
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs, NRR

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2004, PUBLIC MEETING
CONCERNING 2005 FISCAL YEAR TASKS FOR THE DIVISION OF
REGULATORY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

On September 30, 2004, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff met with external stakeholders to discuss the planned Fiscal Year (FY) 2005 tasks and associated schedules that are being worked within the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR), Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs (DRIP). A list of attendees is provided in Attachment 1. The slides presented during the meeting are provided as Attachment 2.

This meeting was a constructive interchange between the staff and external stakeholders concerning the FY 2005 tasks and associated schedules. Stakeholders indicated that the meeting was very beneficial and also suggested that if similar meetings are held in the future that they should be held earlier in the year (if practical).

Frank Gillespie opened the meeting with a general discussion of the structure of DRIP, the functions of the organization, and a discussion of the interrelationship between the three programs in terms of their general tasks and the NRR resources that support the completion of those tasks. Mr. Gillespie noted that the three programs all compete for the same fixed set of resources within NRR, and in addition DRIP competes with the other NRR divisions such as DLPM for these same resources. As a result, there tends to be an impact on DRIP's scheduled tasks and schedules when there are requests from external stakeholders to perform either different tasks (not already scheduled) or to perform current work on a more expedited schedule.

Catherine Haney followed Mr. Gillespie's opening remarks with a discussion of the responsibilities of the Policy and Rulemaking Program, including some of the process and procedural implementation constraints that tend to drive the scope and schedules associated with rulemaking efforts, and the triggers that start the rulemaking process. This discussion was followed by an overview of the rulemaking tasks scheduled for FY 2005 and 2006 (see attached slides) and the basis for why these rulemaking tasks are scheduled. Industry noted that it has an effort underway to examine the entire list of rulemaking activities and to prioritize these activities as low, medium, and high from the industry's perspective.

Next Pao-Tsin (PT) Kuo discussed License Renewal (LR) Program activities noting the current applications under review and the overall status of the LR reviews. Dr. Kuo also discussed the process improvements that are underway to make LR reviews more effective and which are expected to free up NRR resources for use in other program areas. It was noted that for LR reviews to be most effective and to remain on schedule, licensees need to submit quality LR applications that incorporate previous lessons learned and which are supported by good onsite documentation to support the audit team effort.

Finally, Bill Beckner and Laura Dudes discussed responsibilities for the New Reactor Licensing Program and the FY 2005 and 2006 scheduled activities. This discussion was focused primarily in the areas of Early Site Permit (ESP) reviews, design certification reviews and expected submittals, the Part 52 rulemaking and the reasons supporting its re-noticing as a proposed rule, and Combined License (COL) issues and the effort to resolve these issues in support of an anticipated COL application. The major message relayed to stakeholders was that case work (i.e., real applications and real reviews) always takes priority over other work within this program area, and it was acknowledged that these priorities do not always align with the external visibility for some new reactor tasks. Stakeholders were encouraged to communicate in writing with the New Reactor Program Director when stakeholders desire higher priority or more attention to be applied to a particular project. External stakeholders expressed some concern regarding the re-noticing of Part 52 as a proposed rule and whether this situation could repeat itself in the future. This concern is related to the potential for a COL application and that such changes can impact business decisions that are made for advance reactors. It was suggested that a separate meeting should be held that focuses on this issue.

Attachments: As stated

Next Pao-Tsin (PT) Kuo discussed License Renewal (LR) Program activities noting the current applications under review and the overall status of the LR reviews. Dr. Kuo also discussed the process improvements that are underway to make LR reviews more effective and which are expected to free up NRR resources for use in other program areas. It was noted that for LR reviews to be most effective and to remain on schedule, licensees need to submit quality LR applications that incorporate previous lessons learned and which are supported by good onsite documentation to support the audit team effort.

Finally, Bill Beckner and Laura Dudes discussed responsibilities for the New Reactor Licensing Program and the FY 2005 and 2006 scheduled activities. This discussion was focused primarily in the areas of Early Site Permit (ESP) reviews, design certification reviews and expected submittals, the Part 52 rulemaking and the reasons supporting its re-noticing as a proposed rule, and Combined License (COL) issues and the effort to resolve these issues in support of an anticipated COL application. The major message relayed to stakeholders was that case work (i.e., real applications and real reviews) always takes priority over other work within this program area, and it was acknowledged that these priorities do not always align with the external visibility for some new reactor tasks. Stakeholders were encouraged to communicate in writing with the New Reactor Program Director when stakeholders desire higher priority or more attention to be applied to a particular project. External stakeholders expressed some concern regarding the re-noticing of Part 52 as a proposed rule and whether this situation could repeat itself in the future. This concern is related to the potential for a COL application and that such changes can impact business decisions that are made for advance reactors. It was suggested that a separate meeting should be held that focuses on this issue.

Attachments: As stated

Distribution: ADAMS PRay EMcKenna ACubbage TReed
SHoffman FGillespie CHaney WBeckner PKuo

ADAMS Accession No.: Memo ML043000267
Package: ML043190003 Attachment 2: ML043220489

Office	RPRP	SC:RPRP
Name	TReed	EMcKenna
Date	11/17/04	11/ 17/04

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

List of Attendees
September 30, 2004 Meeting with External Stakeholders

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Tim Reed	NRC/NRR/DRIP
Phillip Ray	NRC/NRR/DRIP
William Beckner	NRC/NRR/DRIP
P.T. Kuo	NRC/NRR/DRIP
Sam Lee	NRC/NRR/DRIP
Paul Bailey	ICF/ESE
Clare Kasputys	NRC/OCM/NJD
Laura Dudes	NRC/NRR/DRIP
Nanette Gilles	NRC/NRR/DRIP
Jeremy Tapp	NRC/DSSA/SRXB
Theresa Valentine	NRC/DSSA/SPSB
Rob Sisk	Westinghouse/Fuels
Jim Winters	Westinghouse/AP1000
Russ Bell	NEI
Thomas Kenyon	NRC/NRR/DRIP
Eileen McKenna	NRC/NRR/DRIP
Stewart Schneider	NRC/NRR/DRIP
Adrian Heymer	NRC/NRR/DRIP
Charles Willbanks	ATL International
Glenn Archicoff	AECL Technologies
Deann Raleigh	LIS, Scientech
Carl Berger	Energetics
Steve Hoffman	NRC/NRR/DRIP
George Mencinsky	NRC/NRR/DRIP
Dave Skeen	NRC/NRR/DRIP
Maryann Ashley	NRC/NRR/DIPM
Tomoho Yamada	INES
Steve Pope	ISL
Garry Young	Entergy
Steven Dolley	McGrall Hill
Charles Kling	Westinghouse
Joe Williams	NRC/NRR/DRIP
Amy Cubbage	NRC/NRR/DRIP

Meeting Slides